IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 1607 of 2003

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE KUNDAN SINGH

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

INDUBEN W/O ARVINDBHAI PATEL

Versus

REGIONAL PASSPORT OFFICER

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 1607 of 2003

MS ARCHANA U AMIN for Petitioner No. 1

WITH MS KRISHNA M VYAS for Petitioner No. 1

MR DN PATEL for Respondent No. 1

RULE SERVED BY DS for Respondent No. 1

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE KUNDAN SINGH

Date of decision: 21/02/2003

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. Heard the leaned counsel for the parties.

2. This petition has been filed for a direction to the respondent authority for making correction in the passport already issued to the petitioner with regard to the date of birth of the petitioner as 1st June, 1947 in place of 1-6-1949.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the application/representation has already been moved by the petitioner to the respondent authority for this purpose. But that application/representation has yet not been decided by the respondent authority and the respondent authority is requiring some order for this purpose by a court of competent jurisdiction.

4. In the facts and circumstances of this case, this application is allowed with a direction to the respondent authority to consider and decide the application/representation made by the petitioner and the same is pending before it, on the basis of the material produced on the record in accordance with law, within a period of four weeks from the date of presentation of a certified copy of this order. The respondent authority would be at liberty to pass appropriate order regarding the costs of the proceedings. Rule is made absolute to the aforesaid extent. D.S. is permitted.

(Kundan Singh, J.)

/JVSatwara/